

Exhibit F

CONFIDENTIAL

Duke University
Durham
North Carolina 27708-0005

Office of the President

June 13, 2008

220 Allen Building

Box 90005

Telephone (919) 684-2831

Fax (919) 684-4421

Donna Hanover and Edwin A. Oster
444 E. 86th Street, Apartment 35H
New York, New York 10028

Dear Donna and Ed,

It was good to meet you the other day. I appreciate the concerns you have for Andrew and his future with the golf team. The situation is obviously a complicated one, with substantially differing accounts of what has occurred and why. It is for that reason that I think it important, if no mutually agreeable informal remedy can be found between Andrew and Coach Vincent, to follow the path outlined by University General Counsel Pam Bernard in her letter to Attorney Ekstrand: to use the Student-Athlete Grievance Process as outlined in the Athletic Policy Manual <http://www.duke.edu/web/acouncil/info/documents/AthleticPolicyManual5.18.07.pdf>. That is a process intended to provide our student-athletes with the fullest and fairest hearing from an impartial group of persons when they have disputes with their coach which cannot be resolved otherwise.

From our conversation, I also understood that you had some concerns whether this process could provide a fair hearing of all the facts, given the history of what has happened to date. I told you that I would look in greater detail at the process to assure myself that that would be the case. I have now done so, and I am confident that it will. As you know, the process, as outlined on page 22 of the Manual, has three steps. I think at this point we can mutually agree that steps one and two have either been fully pursued or are no longer relevant. In that case, we move to step three: an appeal by the student-athlete to the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) who can then convene a panel, if she deems appropriate, composed of members of the Athletics Council.

My confidence in the fairness of this process is both structural and personal. The FAR is an appointee of the President of the University and is charged, in part, with assuring that academic and educational goals are always central to what we do in our Athletics programs, even as our student-athletes and coaches pursue athletics excellence. The FAR is a faculty member and brings to that position the values and expectations of a faculty member, albeit one, intentionally, familiar with athletic norms. In the present case, I also know the FAR, Martha Putallaz, well and can fully attest to her integrity, intelligence and deep sense of fairness and commitment to the welfare of our student athletes.

Further, were she to determine that a panel was appropriate, the members of the Athletics Council are similarly either faculty members or non-Athletics administrators who have the interests of our student-athletes fully at heart, again within the context of NCAA Division I athletic competition. I have every confidence that Dr. Putallaz would appoint a panel, if needed, that would meet fully the expectations of a fair hearing for Andrew. It is important to recognize, of course, that the outcome will not define the fairness of the process.

In light of these considerations, I urge you to follow Counsel Bernard's advice and have Andrew approach Dr. Putallaz to request a hearing under the Student-Athlete Grievance procedure as outlined.

Sincerely,



Peter Lange
Provost

PL:sb

cc: Pamela Bernard
Chris Kennedy ✓
Martha Putallaz